

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are the pending claims. The Office Action rejected Claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by “admitted prior art of Figure 1.” (Office Action, page 2.) For the following reasons, the rejection is traversed and it is respectfully submitted that the rejection must be withdrawn.

An anticipation reference requires that a single reference disclose each and every limitation of the rejected claim(s). In the Office Action, the only reference cited is a single figure, i.e. Figure 1. However, each of Claims 1, 6, 10, 13 and 15, which are the independent claims pending in this application, include a recitation of an ad-hoc network, which is not disclosed by Figure 1.

Figure 1 and its relevant description merely teach that a road side equipment requests driving information to vehicles traveling through a prescribed communication area and receives the driving information from the vehicles, such that the received driving information can be adapted as road traffic information.

Figure 1 and its relevant description can not teach forming an ad-hoc network between vehicles as recited in independent Claim 1, registering the registration messages to a node management table as recited in independent Claim 6, and forming an ad-hoc network associated with vehicles on the basis of the registration messages of vehicles, as recited in independent Claims 10, 13 and 15.

The body of the Office Action includes numerous references are made to “Columns” and “lines” (Office Action pages 2-7) that do not correspond to Figure 1, which is cited as the basis for the anticipation rejection. Accordingly, an interview was conducted with the Examiner regarding the appropriateness of the numerous references to “Column” and “line” in the Office Action (see pages 2-7), particularly since this anticipation rejection is made solely in regard a single figure, which does not have any columns or lines. During the interview the Examiner indicated that “Column” should be considered to be “Page.”

The Office Action cites “Column 1, lines 15-28” in regard to “creating an ad-hoc network between vehicles on the basis of registration messages broadcast by the vehicles.” (Office Action, bottom of page 2.) However, contrary to the disclosure alleged by the Examiner, page 1,

lines 15-28, of the specification fails to disclose creating an ad-hoc network as claimed in the present invention. To the contrary, Figure 3 of the Specification, which is not admitted prior art, discloses forming an ad-hoc network between vehicles in accordance with a preferred embodiment of the present invention. (See, e.g., page 4, lines 22-23, and page 6, lines 2-9.)

In addition, independent Claim 6 includes a recitation of registering the registration messages to a node management table. Figure 1 fails to disclose the claimed node management table. The Office Action fails at page 6, where Claim 6 is discussed, to provide any citation that could relate to a node management table.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-24, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Registration No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C.
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Ste. 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
(516) 228-3565